

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 28, and 33-35 are now pending in the application. New claims 36 - 40 are sought to be added to further describe the claimed invention. The Amendment does not introduce new matter, and the entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that he withdraw them.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 22, 25 and 34 - 35 as allegedly being “anticipated” by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,472 to Allsop. Applicants traverse this rejection based on the following Remarks and the above Amendments, and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and that he withdraw it.

In a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every claim element must be present in the applied reference. With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner has stated that Fig. 3 teaches “accessing said real-time detailed dealer information with said manufacturer server system from a remote dealer system via a middleware application system”. Figure 3 however, illustrates a dealer’s Web site 21 implemented on a Web server that, in one embodiment, includes a shopping basket application 25. During interaction with the dealer’s Web site 21, the user’s computer 20 may determine the need to interact with “another computer system 22” which includes a database 26 that is used to store a list of authorized dealers for each of one or more manufacturer’s. [Col. 4 Line 55 – Col. 5, Line 14] A “manufacturer’s computer 23 may send a message over the Internet to the server 22 to cause the server 22 to update the list of authorized dealers for that manufacturer.” [Col. 5 Line 15 – Col. 5 Line 22] The point being, the user’s computer 20 does not interact directly with the manufacturer’s computer. To further clarify: “Hence, the presence of the predetermined tag in the HTML page provided by the dealer’s shopping basket application 25 effectively functions as a request by the dealer to be validated. The validation request includes the name of the dealer maintaining the Web site 21. In response to receiving the validation request, the server 22 queries the database 26 with the name of the dealer provided in the validation request and returns to the user’s computer 20 a list of the manufactures for which the dealer is authorized.” [Col. 5 Line 40 – 57] Therefore, Figure 3 illustrates a user’s computer interacting with a dealer’s Web site on one server, then interacting with a second server (22) to validate the authorization of the dealer. Figure 3 does not illustrate the user’s computer

interacting with the manufacturer's computer. Therefore, Figure 3 does not teach "accessing said real-time detailed dealer information [requested by a client system] with said manufacturer server system from a remote dealer server system via a middleware application system". Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 34 and 35 "under the same rationale set forth above in Claim 1". However, as discussed above, Figure 3 does not teach "accessing said real-time detailed dealer information [requested by a client system] with said manufacturer server system from a remote dealer server system via a middleware application system", as recited in Claim 34 and 35. Therefore Claim 34 and 35 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 8, 15, and 22 have been amended to recite a "manufacturer's server system hosting a manufacturer's web site and a plurality of dealer's web sites". In light of this amendment, Claims 8, 15, and 22 are believed to be allowable.

In view of the aforementioned comments, Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 30, 31 and the associated dependent claims are believed to be allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103


The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 5 – 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, 17, 19 – 21, 23, 24, and 26 – 28 under the obviousness provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants believe that since independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are believed to be allowable, the associated dependent claims are also allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. In addition, newly added claims 36 – 40 are believed to be allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that he withdraw them. The Examiner is

courteously invited to telephone the undersigned representative if he believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Bryan McPherson
Registration No. 41,988
Caterpillar Inc.

Telephone: (309) 675-4015
Facsimile: (309) 675-1236